

**Solid Waste Alternatives Program Advisory Council
Urbandale Public Library
July 20, 2009: 9 a.m.**

Agenda

9:00 a.m. Meeting Begins

9:15 a.m. Public Participation Period (3 Minutes Per Person)

Jen Jordan and Shelly Codner absent.

Approval of Agenda

DECISION ITEM

No discussion

Motion and 2 nd to approve Unanimous approval

Approval of Minutes

DECISION ITEM

- 6-23-2009

Motion and 2 nd to approve Unanimous approval

Budget Report - 2009 Expenses

INFORMATION

- Receipt requirements for all reimbursement requests going forward.
 - Anything outside of mileage needs receipts in order to be paid.
- \$5,246 total. \$3,824 was for the workshop. The rest of it was for the Robert Rules of Order book and mileage claims.
Addendum: (we had an additional expense that wasn't accounted for prior to the meeting) The total expenses for FY09 are \$5,358.04.

Requests for Clarifications

DECISION ITEM

- Council responses

We will discuss each question then approve it as a whole document.
(see the request for clarifications for complete questions and responses.)

Public Comments

No public comments.

Request for Clarifications (Continued)

#3 – Sara: Conflict of interests was not one of our criteria in selecting a vendor for moving forward.

Tony – that's not clear at all. If they have a conflict, they can't be participating. We don't want contractors and applicants working together.

Scott – a conflict could develop over time.

Tony – definition would be anyone working with any potential applicant.

Mary – how do we define it?

Tony – if you hired someone and are paying them...and these people are working with us, then that is a conflict.

Sara – what about past work with the consultant?

There's no way to put points in, or take away from for that.

Tony – We have 2 types: conflicts of people on this council who may apply. The other conflict is the consultant's conflict with the applicant.

Sara – Could we say: whichever consultant we hire must agree they won't also work with an applicant on preparing applications or other EMS scope work.

Tony – They must have a period of time that they can't be the consultant for...including past work.

Sara – My opinion is that this is unfair. It would be applying it retroactively. I can see going forward they can only work with the contractor on these tasks...but I don't want to go back on past work.

Brian – our response should be that our response is the same as what we said on the RFQ.

Tony – Every time this has come up, we haven't discussed the conflicts of the consultants.

Mary – This is laid out in the RFQ eligibility discussion. They talked about conflicts of interest in the RFQ.

Tony – No, they could still be disqualified because of a conflict. We changed the grading for the RFQ during the meeting. We have the ability to change this now.

Leslie – Can't we say moving forward they can't work with the applicant concurrently as a consultant for us.

Tony – but there's still an issue of past work. We don't know who the applicants will be. We need to tell the consultants that this is still an issue that we will look at. They could still be disqualified because of it.

Sara – If you are hired as the council's consultant, our expectation is that you don't work with the 6 pilot areas on this going forward.

Tony – we need to draw the line. They shouldn't be doing any work at all with them.

Sherry – we are backpedaling. We've revisited this, it's an imperfect issue we're going to just have to do our best to deal with.

Tony – we have one applicant that works with several applicants that may be pilots.

Tom - when we go through the process it will reveal itself.

Tony – but we may go back and not select someone because of a conflict. I'm fine with that, but they may still be disqualified because of a conflict.

Sara – if we think we may create a standard for the relationship, we owe it to the proposers to let them know what the standard is. What working relationships may or may not be allowed.

Leslie – If we are coming up with a rule we need to disclose it now. They need to know up front if we are laying out ground rules.

Tom – Tony's position is known. It's good for the consultants to know if you are a consultant you can't work with the applicants on things other than EMS.

Scott – My board signs off on relationships...some are more distant, and not related to EMS at all. (drainage district work is an example) I'd hate to disqualify them because of this relationship that has no impact on the EMS at all.

Tony - but there are relationships that would be related. (gas work)

Scott – we could follow that trail and see it is related to the Council's work. We could work some of this out in the contract.

Sara – We need to identify the ground rules.

Tony – The consultant isn't going to work with any pilot applicant.

Mary – Does that include monitoring, etc. (they may have multi-year contracts)

Tony – the work you are doing for EMS is broad. That's all they should work on.

Brian – will the consultant work with the implementation?

Tom – 18 months of involvement.

Tony – what if the state is paying for them to lay the groundwork to create business.

Scott – that’s part of the nature of this though...it could happen with whoever we hire whether they're currently working in Iowa or not.

Tony – we need to say there is a minimum we are looking at as far as conflicts go.

Tony – someone could be hiring a consultant to apply, and we’re going to hire the consultant to grade them.

Brian – we are doing the grading, the consultant may help with the application, but they are not helping with the selection.

Tony – As long as the consultants and the applicants know that we will be looking at their relationships.

Brian – this should have no impact on selecting the consultant and/or applicant.

Sara – once we have established an expectation, it’s up to the consultant to sit down and make a decision.

Tony – the consultant needs to read our minutes and understand the concerns of some council members.

#4 See discussion for question number 3.

Motion and 2nd to approve responses to requests for clarification
Unanimous approval

Becky will send these out as soon as they are finalized.

RFP Selection Process

DECISION ITEM

- Interview team?

Interview team volunteers?

We haven’t established how many people we will interview? Do we want the whole group to do the interviews? Keep in mind that that would be a public meeting. At the previous meeting we thought the interviews would be better with a team, as it’s more open. But in the interest of conflict of interest the more open the better.

We need a group to come up with the interview questions. Leslie, Scott, and Tony.

Interview questions will be prepared in advance.

Interview process is done by the whole council.

Motion and 2nd to approve
Unanimous approval

What about secondary interviews? If we can’t choose from 2 then we can do follow up interviews, but hopefully we can make a selection with the initial interviews.

RFP Score Sheets

DECISION ITEM

Do we want to do a points, or ranking? Ranking may even out some of the extreme likes/dislikes so they are more equally weighted.

Using points is hard because everyone has their own scale.

Ranking takes away the skewed points.

We need an overall rank of the total proposal.

We could have each council member evaluate each criteria and come up with total points for each proposal. We all use the same criteria. You turn that in, and we turn it in

to a 1 through 5 ranking. Then it's transparent we used the same criteria and same weights on the evaluation.

Points aren't defined in the RFP. We just need to understand what we mean.

Angie will develop the score sheet.

Motion: Council will make selection based upon total points awarded.

2nd for discussion.

Each criteria gets a number based upon the percentage weighted to it. 26% gets 1-26 points to it.

Should we throw out the highest and lowest? No. We need to be consistent from proposer to proposer.

As long as you are consistent in your own evaluations then it's ok.

Voting will be done on a total points system

5:2 (Sara and Leslie against)

Motion and 2 nd to approve Approved 5 to 2
--

Scheduling Future Meetings

INFORMATION

- September 2, 2009, 9 a.m., Urbandale Public Library
 - RFP application review/discussion (due 8-25-09) (determine follow-up interview necessity)
 - Scoring Due to Becky September 1st by 9:00 a.m.
 - Laying out the pilot application scoring matrix. (Shelly, Sara, Leslie)
- September 17, 2009, 1 p.m., TBD
 - Pilot applications review/discussion/selection (due 8-31-09)
 - RFP application selection

Interviews may be performed between September 2nd and 17th.

Future Agenda Items

- Presentations by those with resources. (Al Bonini, etc.)
- When does the 5 year comprehensive plan cycle start?
- Definition of Small/Medium/Large Planning Area/Landfills
- How to disseminate/share successes/problems learned from this process (another workshop?)
- Annual Report: Content, Criteria, Enforcement for no progress (put this info in rulemaking?)
- Timeline of pilots? When will more be added on?

Adjourn

DECISION ITEM

Motion and 2 nd to adjourn Unanimous approval

Homework

- Becky will send requests for clarifications out as soon as they are finalized.
- We need a group to come up with the interview questions. (Leslie, Scott, and Tony.)

- Angie will develop the score sheet.
- RFP Consultant Scoring Due to Becky September 1st, 9 a.m. ***late scores will not be counted.**
- Laying out the pilot application scoring matrix. (Shelly, Sara, Leslie)

